

The Calibration of the HST Kuiper Belt Object Search: Setting the Record Straight

Anita L. Cochran¹

Astronomy Department & McDonald Observatory, University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712

Harold F. Levison¹, Peter Tamblyn¹, S. Alan Stern¹

Space Science Department, Southwest Research Institute, Boulder, CO 80302

Martin J. Duncan¹

Department of Physics, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada K7L 3N6

ABSTRACT

The limiting magnitude of the HST data set used by Cochran *et al.* (1995) to detect small objects in the Kuiper belt is reevaluated, and the methods used are described in detail. It is shown, by implanting artificial objects in the original HST images, and re-reducing the images using our original algorithm, that the limiting magnitude of our images (as defined by the 50% detectability limit) is $V = 28.4$. This value is statistically the same as the value found in the original analysis. We find that $\sim 50\%$ of the moving Kuiper belt objects with $V = 27.9$ are detected when trailing losses are included. In the same data in which these faint objects are detected, we find that the number of false detections brighter than $V = 28.8$ is less than one per WFPC2 image. We show that, primarily due to a zero-point calibration error, but partly due to inadequacies in modeling the HST's data noise characteristics and Cochran et al.'s reduction techniques, Brown et al. 1997 underestimate the SNR of objects in the HST dataset by over a factor of 2, and their conclusions are therefore invalid.

Subject headings: comets: general – solar system: formation – solar system: general

¹Based on observations with NASA/ESA Hubble Space Telescope obtained at the Space Telescope Science Institute, which is operated by Universities for Research in Astronomy, Incorporated, under NASA contract NAS5-26555.

1. Introduction

In Cochran *et al.* (1995, hereafter CLSD), we reported the statistical detection, based on observations obtained with the Hubble Space Telescope, of a population of small objects which were resident in the Kuiper belt. The objects detected had visual magnitude between 27.8 and 28.6, implying radii between ~ 5 and ~ 10 km (assuming an albedo of 4%).

At the time of publication, the results of CLSD were criticized on two grounds. The first is that the detections were statistical in nature; we are unable to fit orbits to our objects. Indeed, there is a small possibility that our results were a statistical fluke, a possibility which new, deeper HST observations will explore. The second is that the number of detections did not agree with extrapolations of the size distribution of large Kuiper belt objects determined from early ground-based observations (although Weissman & Levison 1997 showed that the CLSD results were in agreement with the numbers of Kuiper belt objects needed to populate the known Jupiter-family comets). Newer ground-based surveys have changed our understanding of the size distributions of large objects so that CLSD results are now consistent with the ground-based observations by Jewitt *et al.* (1997).

Recently however, Brown *et al.* (1997, hereafter BKL) have contended that the detections reported in CLSD were not possible, based on an analysis of the noise properties of the data. BKL created a simple model of the HST data reduction of CLSD. They contended that CLSD could not have detected the objects claimed because the objects would be overwhelmed by a very large number of measurements that lie above the detection threshold (hereafter known as ‘false detections’) due to noise fluctuations.

In this paper we refute the analysis of BKL by showing that it is indeed possible to detect objects of $V \sim 28.6$ in the original CLSD data set without being swamped by false detections. Our argument is simple and persuasive. We implanted artificial objects in the original CLSD images with magnitudes between $V = 26.5$ and 29.5 . We then reduced these images using exactly the same procedures used in CLSD, including the same automated search algorithm to find the objects. The original four members of the HST Kuiper belt team performed this analysis for the original CLSD paper. As a check of the previous work, we asked Peter Tamblyn, who has therefore become an author of this paper, to independently reproduce this analysis. In his reanalysis, he used the same algorithm as CLSD, but all his codes and IRAF scripts were independently developed. As we show below, this independent reanalysis agrees with CLSD’s original results.

2. The Test

It is well established that one of the most accurate methods for determining the limiting magnitude of a set of images is to place artificial objects, of known magnitudes, in the data and search for them (Mateo 1988; Harris 1990). This type of procedure has been routinely used by most observers searching for objects in the Kuiper Belt (e.g. Luu & Jewitt 1988; Hainaut et al. 1994; Jewitt et al. 1996) and was used by us in CLSD in order to determine the limiting magnitude of our survey.

The CLSD data set consists of 34 WFPC2 exposures of a field on the ecliptic near morning quadrature with the “Wide V” (F606W) filter on HST/WFPC2. Each exposure was 500–600 sec, for a total integration time of 5 hours. Thirty hours elapsed from the start of the first exposure to the end of the last. For an outer solar system body observed at quadrature, the Earth’s parallactic motion is near zero so that any apparent motion of the body is attributable to the body’s orbit. For a body in the Kuiper belt the orbital motion is $\lesssim 1 \text{ arcsec hr}^{-1}$. With the plate scale of the WF chips, this orbital motion is equal to $\lesssim 10 \text{ pixels hr}^{-1}$, or $\sim 1 \text{ pixel}$ per ten minute exposure, or up to 300 pixels in 30 hours.

The data were reduced using the following procedures: We first produced a median sum of all 34 exposures (scaled by the mode of the central 500×500 pixels). This left a high signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) image with all of the stars and galaxies but with no Kuiper belt objects and no radiation events. Then, this median sum image was normalized to match the background of each individual image and subtracted from each. The difference images were renormalized to their original background values. At this point, we had 34 images with just radiation events, moving objects, and noise (and no stars or galaxies).

The next step was to combine the images so that only the Kuiper belt objects remained. First, we shifted the images so that a Kuiper belt object appeared in the same pixel in all of the frames. To accomplish this, we specified 154 valid (see CLSD for a definition) Kuiper belt orbits and computed the drift rate of an object moving on that orbit during the interval of our observations. We shifted each image, to a fraction of a pixel, to compensate for the drift rate to produce 34 images which were co-aligned for the desired orbit. Then we combined the shifted images into a set of 6 medians. Each median contained half of the images. Since we used the shifted images, a Kuiper belt object with the predicted drift rate would be in the same pixel for each of these images, and thus would remain. In contrast, random radiation events would be unlikely to co-align. The resulting medians were then fed to an automatic search routine that examined each of the combined images for faint objects. See CLSD for a detailed description of our reduction techniques and search algorithm.

In order to understand our limiting magnitudes, we implanted artificial objects in the

original 34 WFPC2 exposures. The total number of counts, n , that an object of magnitude m_{606W} produces in an exposure of length t through the F606W filter is (Leitherer et al. 1995)

$$n = t 10^{0.4(22.933 - m_{606W})}. \quad (1)$$

The conversion between m_{606W} and Johnson V has been given by Holtzman et al. (1995) as

$$V = m_{606W} + 0.253(V - I) + 0.012(V - I)^2. \quad (2)$$

Using $V - I$ for the Sun (+0.81), we have $V = m_{606W} + 0.21$. All magnitudes quoted below are Johnson V magnitudes and are based on this calibration.

It is important to note that BKL used Equation (1) in order to calculate the signal of their model and that they did not include the color terms given in Equation (2). Thus, their signal was too small by 0.21 magnitudes or by approximately 20%. This error corresponds to an overestimate in the number of false detections of a factor of approximately 2.5. Although this error in BKL was significant, it cannot nearly explain the differences between our empirical results and their model. We shall discuss this point again below.

We implanted artificial objects of known magnitude into each of the original 34 exposures using the IRAF routine ‘MKOBJECTS’. The PSF was assumed to be a Moffat distribution with a full width at half maximum of 1.3 pixels and a $\beta = 2.5$. We verified that this PSF is reasonable for our purposes by showing that the fraction of light that falls within our photometry aperture (a five pixel plus) was indeed the same as that from the actual HST PSF as determined by Biretta et al. (1996). Poisson noise was added to each of the pixels in the PSF. Each object was implanted at a different sub-pixel location in each exposure to simulate it moving on an arbitrary Kuiper belt orbit.

It is important to our argument that we know that MKOBJECTS performed correctly. Unfortunately, the objects that were implanted in the original WFPC2 exposures were much too faint to be detected in an individual exposure because of the large number of radiation events. Thus, we performed the following test. First, we fabricated an image with the same dimensions as a WFPC2 image except that each pixel had the same value (no noise). We implanted artificial objects into this image using the procedures outlined above (including noise). We then calculated the number of counts in each of our artificial objects using aperture photometry. The dots in Figure 1 show the mean number of counts for our artificial objects as a function of V magnitude. The solid curve shows the expected value as determined by combining Equations 1 and 2. Clearly, MKOBJECTS worked properly.

Satisfied that our artificial objects contained the correct amount of signal, we then processed the real WFPC2 images containing the artificial objects using the standard reduction procedure described in CLSD. The black squares in Figure 2 show the probability

of detection as a function of magnitude as determined in CLSD. To calculate these data we implanted a total of 200 artificial objects of known magnitude into each of the original 34 exposures; 20 magnitudes were selected ranging from $V = 26.5$ to 29.5 and 10 objects were implanted at each magnitude. We found that the automatic search was complete to at least $V = 27$ and probably fainter. No artificial objects fainter than $V = 29.5$ were detected. There is an approximately linear relationship between the detection probability and V between these two extremes. Following Harris(1990), we defined the “limiting magnitude” of our search as $V = 28.6$, corresponding to a detection probability of 50%.

In order to insure that there was no bug in our codes or our IRAF scripts, the original CLSD team asked Peter Tamblyn to independantly reproduce this analysis. He used the same algorithm as CLSD, but wrote his own codes and IRAF scripts. He ran 165 experiments. In each he implanted 20 objects of constant magnitude. His results are presented as the gray circles in Figure 2. He found that the search was complete to slightly fainter than $V = 27.5$. The limiting magnitude (50% detection probability) was found to be $V = 28.4$. Although this is 0.2 magnitudes brighter than found by CLSD, an examination of Figure 2 show that this independent new analysis is in good agreement with that of CLSD. The difference in the two limiting magnitudes is statistical in nature.

The values presented in Figure 2 were calculated assuming that the orbit of the Kuiper belt objects are precisely known. As such, it is an accurate representation of the limiting magnitude of the images convolved with our reduction techniques. It does not, however, take into account the fact that real objects could be slightly smeared in the images due to the finite grid spacing of our search orbits (see CLSD for a discussion). Thus, we performed four experiments where we implanted 20 objects of fixed V magnitude into our HST images using a range of orbits that were slightly offset from the one we used to search for them. In each experiment, we used 9 orbits which where uniformly distributed throughout one quarter of an orbit grid. The results of these experiments are shown as stars in Figure 2. The calibration shows that for $V = 27.9$ objects, $\sim 50\%$ are discovered if smearing is included. Even with these trailing losses included, objects at $V = 28.6$ are detected.

BKL’s argument against the detection of $V = 28.6$ objects is that the SNR from such objects would be so small that the number of false detections (predicted to be 10,000 per orbit per WF chip ²) would swamp the detection of real objects. In Figure 3 we plot the number of false detections that we actually found in our final images derived from CLSD’s retrograde orbit set, as a function of magnitude. The number is $\sim 10^{-4}$ smaller than BKL’s

²The prediction should be ~ 4000 when corrected for BKL’s magnitude zeropoint error.

prediction ³.

BKL attempted to explain the inconsistency between their models and our results by arguing that our reduction procedures artificially smooth the data. Therefore, they contend, our procedures would artificially decrease the noise and number of false detections. BKL argued that this smoothing would also affect the signal so that $V = 28.6$ objects would be undetectable. However, the experiment we presented in the last paragraph proves that BKL’s argument cannot be true since $V = 28.6$ objects are indeed detectable! In particular, they are detectable in the same images that we measured a low number of false detections! Another (and more correct) explanation for the difference between BKL’s model and our empirical analysis is that BKL underestimated the SNR.

3. Discussion

A remaining question is: ‘Why did BKL drastically underestimate the SNR?’ A complete discussion of this is beyond the scope of this paper. However, there were several ways in which BKL’s model differed from what was actually done in CLSD. We combined the data using medians; they used means. Medians are less sensitive to the deviations of the noise distribution from Gaussian ⁴. They assumed that the noise followed a Gaussian distribution. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of a median combine of 34 images shifted assuming a retrograde orbit (one where no objects are expected) yields a probability of 0.1% that the distribution of the pixel values from this median combination is Gaussian. We constructed 6 combinations of the images, each containing half the images, and searched for objects in each combination. BKL constructed only one mean. While our six combinations are not independent, because of the nature of the data they still discriminate well against false detections because a high pixel must show up in most of the sums, not just in one or two sums. Finally, their estimate for the number of false detections is based on the assumption that there were 10^6 statistically independent measurements. However, since each measurement was constructed from 5 pixels, and an individual pixel was included in 5 measurements, the measurements were not statistically independent of one another. This

³Although BKL’s prediction of the number of false detections is several orders of magnitude larger than we observe, it is important to note that it only represents a difference of approximately a factor of 2 in SNR!

⁴BKL indicate that there would be a $1-\sigma$ noise in a five-pixel plus of 27.9 and that this is a factor of $\sqrt{\pi/2}$ larger than would be found if CLSD had used means. Our measured σ for five-pixel plusses formed from median data is 23.7. This factor, alone, changes the value of $1 - f(x)$ for the Gaussian distribution function from 3.67% to 1.74% or the number of false detections by a factor of 2.1. The number of false detections is decreased more when the neglected color term is included.

effect alone will account for a significant difference in the number of false detections.

In order to determine whether the differences between our results and those of BKL were due to the difference in technique, we took our original HST images with 20 fake objects embedded in them and processed them according to the methods of BKL. Like BKL, we determined the number of false detections brighter than $m_{606W} = 28.6$ ($V = 28.8$), adopting BKL’s value of the total counts through our aperture. We find that we can reproduce BKL’s results using their techniques ⁵.

Since we also reproduce our original CLSD results when we use CLSD’s methods, we conclude that the differences between our two techniques account for the differences in the results. Therefore, we also conclude that BKL’s conclusions are faulty because their model did not accurately represent the HST data, nor the methods of CLSD.

4. Concluding Remarks

We have shown with simple, straightforward, empirical methods that the statistical detection of a population of small (~ 10 km-sized) Kuiper belt objects by CLSD is indeed reasonable, despite the claims of BKL to the contrary. We find that the limiting magnitude of the CLSD images (as defined by the 50% detectability limit) is $V = 28.4$ and that objects can be detected down to at least $V = 29$. In addition, we find that $\sim 50\%$ of the moving Kuiper belt objects with $V = 27.9$ are detected when trailing losses are included. These results were arrived at by implanting artificial objects of known magnitudes in the images, and re-reducing the images using the original CLSD algorithms. As a check, we performed this experiment with two completely different sets of software.

We wish to emphasize several aspects of the test performed in this paper. First and foremost, the artificial objects were implanted in the original 34 HST images before we started our reduction procedures (immediately after the pipeline processing). These were the images that BKL used to estimate the noise in the first step of their modeling. As

⁵ Interestingly, the number of false detections derived from BKL’s model is very sensitive to how the background is defined. BKL never explain how they defined this, so we adopted two different approaches: *i*) find the median of all pixels in all 34 images and *ii*) compute the sums of the pixels in our aperture using the BKL clipping algorithm and average these values. These two methods yield backgrounds which differ by ~ 0.5 counts/pixel/image. The results of our search showed that BKL’s method is extremely sensitive to this variation in the background level with the number of false detections ranging from a few to tens of thousands. The values we obtained bracket the prediction of BKL. Clearly, another problem with BKL’s model is that it is *extremely* sensitive to the exact methods used.

shown in Figure 1, the number of counts in our artificial objects is consistent with BKL’s estimate (correcting for the color zero-point). BKL claimed to have propagated these estimates of signal and noise through our data reduction techniques and determined that the SNR of a 28.6 magnitude object is too small for the object to be detected. Here, we took what is effectively BKL’s signal and noise, actually ran these numbers through our data reduction techniques and found objects at 28.6. In the same data that we detected $V = 28.6$ objects, we found only a small number of false detections at the same count level, not the large number predicted by BKL. Note that our data reduction process is totally automated. Thus, the results of these experiments have not been influenced by the knowledge that there were artificial objects in the data.

As noted above, though we differ with BKL by orders of magnitude on the number of false detections, we only need to disagree by a factor of two on the signal/noise. We have identified several places where this discrepancy in SNR could arise, such as the neglect of the color term of equation 2 by BKL (0.21 mag), the assumed noise characteristics of the data after application of CLSD data reduction techniques, and the lack of independence of the pixels in the plus. All these factors together can explain why the model of BKL does not match the procedures of CLSD.

We would like to thank C. Chapman, W. Cochran, R. Gladstone, J. Parker, and P. Weissman for comments on the text. We are grateful to an anonymous referee of BKL’s original *Icarus* paper, who first pointed out that CLSD’s calibration experiments prove that BKL’s model is flawed.

REFERENCES

- Biretta, J.A. *et al.* 1996. *WFPC2 Instrument Handbook, Version 4.0* (Baltimore: STScI).
Brown, M.E., Kulkarni, S.R., Liggett, T.J. 1997. *ApJ*, **490**, L119. (BKL)
Cochran, A., Levison, H., Stern, S.A., & Duncan, M. 1995. *ApJ*, **455**, 342. (CLSD)
Hainaut, O., West, R. M., Smette, A. & Marsden, B. G. 1994. *A&A*, **289**, 311
Harris, W. E. 1990. *PASP*, **102**, 949.
Holtzman, J., *et al.* 1995. *PASP*, **107**, 156.
Jewitt, D., Luu, J., & Chen, J. 1996. *AJ*, **112**, 1225.
Jewitt, D., Luu, J., Trujillo, C. & Chen, J. 1997. *BAAS*, **29**, 1020.
Leitherer, C. 1995. *HST Data Handbook, Version 2.0* (Baltimore: STScI).

Luu, J., & Jewitt, D. 1988. AJ, **95**, 1256.

Mateo, M. 1988. ApJ, **331**, 261.

Weissman, P., & Levison, H. 1997. In *Pluto and Charon*, eds. D.J. Tholen and S.A. Stern (Tucson: University of Arizona Press), 559-604.

5. Figure Captions

Fig. 1.— The total number of counts in an object in an individual HST WFPC2 field as a function of V magnitude. The exposure time was 500 sec. The dots represent the mean of a set of 10 artificial objects at each magnitude. These data were collected using aperture photometry as described in the text. The curve is the expected calibration of our data from Leitherer et al. (1995, Equation 1), corrected for the color zero-point offset of Holtzman et al. (1995, Equation 2).

Fig. 2.— The probability that an artificial object is detected by our automated reduction software as a function of V Magnitude, as defined in Equations 1 and 2. The objects were placed at random, sub-pixel locations in the field. The black squares represent the results from CLSD’s experiment of implanting artificial objects in the data. Each square represents an experiment where 10 artificial objects of the same magnitude were implanted (thus the resolution is ± 0.1). The gray circles represent our new calibration which resulted from 165 individual experiments, each with 20 artificial objects implanted precisely on the orbits being searched. The results of several of these experiments overlap one another. In order to illustrate this the size of the circles represent the number of experiments it represents. Each star represents the average value of 90 similar experiments to estimate the probability of detecting objects when trailing losses from a complete range of orbits are included.

Fig. 3.— The number of false detections in a single image directly measured in our reduced data as a function of V Magnitude, as defined in Equations 1 and 2. This curve was determined by counting the total number of false detections in CLSD’s 154 retrograde orbits and normalizing to a single image by dividing by 154.





